

UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



LIMITED

T/AC.41/SR.21
8 August 1951

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Ninth Session

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Flushing Meadow, New York
on Wednesday, 25 July 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Examination of petitions concerning Togoland under British Administration: draft sixth report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/AC.41/L.11)

Examination of petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration: draft seventh report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Petitions (T/AC.41/L.12)

Examination of petitions concerning Togoland under French Administration summarized in document T/L.177/Add.1, T/PET.7/212, T/PET.7/212/Add.1, T/PET.7/212/Add.2, T/PET.7/221, T/PET.7/221/Add.1, T/PET.7/225, T/PET.7/227, T/PET.7/227/Add.1, T/PET.7/228, T/PET.7/228/Add.1, T/PET.7/235, T/PET.7/236, T/PET.7/237, T/PET.7/237/Add.1

Chairman: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON Thailand

Members:

Mr. LESCURE	Argentina
Mr. WENDELEN	Belgium
Mr. SCOTT	New Zealand
Mr. SOLDATOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. STRONG	United States of America

Also present:

Mr. SUTHERLAND	Special Representative for the Trust Territory of Togoland under British Administration
Mr. PIGNON	France, Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of Togoland under French Administration
Mr. ANTOR	Togoland Congress

Secretariat:

Mr. RAPOPORT	Secretary of the Committee
--------------	----------------------------

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING TOGOLAND UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION:

DRAFT SIXTH REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/AC.41/L.11)

Draft Resolution X: Petition from Mr. Sigfried Kwami Etse (T/PET.6/270)

Draft resolution X was adopted by 4 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The relevant part of the report was adopted unanimously.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) apologized for having arrived after the opening of the meeting and after draft resolution X had already been adopted. He would have liked to suggest an amendment to reconcile the text of the draft resolution with that of the petition which raised the question of remuneration for the services of the petitioner's daughter and not the question of payment for her education.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) thought it would suffice to replace the word "education" by the word "upkeep".

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) was afraid that that amendment would not meet his objections.

/Mr. WENDELEN

Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) pointed out that paragraph 9 of the petition was not clear and that a vague formula would have to be found.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) suggested that the phrase "for the services which he claims were rendered by his daughter" should be inserted after the word "payment".

The CHAIRMAN called for a second vote on the draft resolution as amended.

Draft resolution X, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution XI: Petition from the Togoland Youth Association (T/PET.6/275)

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) suggested that the words "continue to" should be inserted before the word "devote" in paragraph 4 of the operative part of Alternative B.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that those words did not appear in paragraph 6 of the text given on page 36 of the report.

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) withdrew his amendment.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) introduced certain drafting amendments to the USSR proposal.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) pointed out that the petition raised the question of the unification of Togoland which was not within the competence of the Committee. He proposed that, when the Secretary prepared the list of petitions to be annexed to the Council's resolution on the Ewe question and on the unification of Togoland, the petition should be included in the list in view of the contents of paragraph 1.

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative A (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) to the vote.

Alternative A was rejected by 5 votes to 1.

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative B (Belgium and the United States of America) to the vote.

Alternative B was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

The relevant part of the report, with the revised USSR proposal, was adopted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) proposed that the phrase "might be established, the scope of which would include Southern Togoland" should be inserted at the bottom of page 26 of the English text after the words "than the present body".

Draft resolution XII: Petition from the Togoland Youth Association (T/PET.6/278)

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative A (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) to the vote.

Alternative A was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative B (United States of America) to the vote.
Alternative B was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) pointed out that the facts cited in the phrase "with a membership of sixteen chiefs and fourteen other members elected" in the relevant part of the report (pages 28-29) were inaccurate. It should read "the present membership of which was ten chiefs and eight other members, all elected by the Native Authorities".

Draft resolution XIII: Petition from the Togoland Farmers' Union (T/PET.6/204) and petition from the Togoland National Farmers' Union (T/PET.6/280).

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) wondered whether in view of the explanations furnished by the Administering Authority the impression given by paragraph 3 of the operative part was in line with the facts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) thought that the text should be amended and that paragraph 3 should be replaced by the following: "Notes that Togoland was represented on the former Gold Coast Cocoa Marketing Board and that procedures have been established for consulting the Togoland cocoa planters:

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) endorsed the text proposed by the Special Representative which met his objections. Furthermore, he thought that the first part of paragraph 2 of the operative part reading: "Further draws the attention of the petitioners to the fact that in the opinion of the Council" should be replaced by the simpler phrase "Considers that". In addition, it would be better to replace the word "defend", which had a negative connotation by the word "promote".

Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) endorsed the amendment proposed by the United States representative. He wondered whether it should not be stated indirectly that practical considerations made it impossible to satisfy the wish expressed by the petitioners to see a Togoland cocoa marketing board set up. He therefore proposed that the phrase "under the existing conditions" should be inserted after the words "Considers that".

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) thought that if the Committee wished to have paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the operative part conform more closely to the new paragraph 3, it might be made clear that the resolution referred to "Togoland" cocoa producers in paragraphs 4 and 5 and producers "of the Territory" in paragraph 6.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that in alternative A the text which followed the words "democratic principles" should be replaced by the words "and composed of the representatives of indigenous population and not subordinate to any organs of the Gold Coast".

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) proposed certain amendments to the preamble: the words "with the prior approval of the Governor in Council" should be inserted after the words "the Minister of Commerce" in paragraph b (1) of the fourth paragraph of the preamble; the phrase "in consultation with the Governor in Council" should be inserted in paragraph b (2) after the words "it was for the Minister to decide". The following text: "the operations of the Board were subject to independent audit; these and the records of cocoa purchased in the Trust Territory have never been challenged; the amount produced in Togoland during 1950 came to something over 23,000 tons as
/compared

compared with 116,000 tons for Ashanti and 108,000 tons for the Colony" should be substituted for that part of paragraph c beginning with the words "these figures were obtained by".

Lastly, he would like the Committee to explain what it understood by the words "more detailed information" in paragraph 10 of the operative part. Were they to be taken to mean "fuller"? If so, the Administering Authority had supplied all the available production figures for which the Council had made a request during its previous session.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) thought that the information should be more detailed. He seemed to remember that the Council had called for the publication not only of cocoa production figures but also the data on which those figures were based.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) remarked that the report of the Administration for 1950 reproduced the text of the report on the situation made by the Chairman of the Board and that a summary of that text had been published in the Territory. There were, he added, several cocoa buying centres in the Territory and if "detailed information" meant figures for each centre that fact should be made clear in the draft resolution. The Special Representative would then ask that the figures should be published in that manner and sent to the Trusteeship Council.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) did not consider that the Council was in a position to decide as to the details of the information to be provided but detailed information should be made widely available to the farmers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) proposed that the second part of paragraph 10 of the operative part should read as follows: "... and that information on this subject will continue to be made available as widely as possible to the cocoa producers in Togoland".

/Mr. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) proposed that paragraph (c) of the preamble should be amended by the substitution of the words "came just over" for the words "came to something over".

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative A to the vote.

Alternative A was rejected by 4 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN put Alternative B to the vote.

Alternative B was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the corresponding part of the report would embody the changes which the USSR representative had made in his draft.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) asked that the corresponding part of the report should be amended in the light of the changes made in the draft. The third paragraph of the summary of the observations of the Administering Authority should be amended so as to be consistent with paragraph (c) of the preamble and the last paragraph of that summary should be amended by the addition of the words "in Council" after the word "Governor" and by the substitution of the word "public interest was affected" for the words "public interest was endangered".

Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) said that regions and divisions should not be confused as the Administration had confused them in some of its observations which were summarized in paragraph 2 of sub-paragraph (b) of the third section of the preamble. The Togoland Farmers' Union included thirty-seven cocoa producing regions while the division was a tribal unit. He noted that he had already stressed that point in a preceding statement and expressed surprise at the absence of a reference to his remarks in the text of the draft resolution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) emphatically stated that the resolution adopted by the representatives of thirty-three sections of the Togoland Farmers' Union bore the signatures of the farmers followed by the name of the division to which they belonged.

/Mr. ANTOR

Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) explained that the farmers had indicated the division and in some cases the State to which they belonged, to establish their identity fully, but they represented agricultural regions rather than divisions. In his opinion, it was essential for the Committee to correct paragraph 2 of sub-paragraph (b) of the preamble which was likely to lead to confusion.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Committee's procedure was to take note of the comments of the Special Representative as he had expressed them and that the draft resolution had already been adopted in Mr. Antor's absence, adding that Mr. Antor's statements would appear in the summary record and in the report.

At the request of Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) declared that he would like to have the draft resolution stress the fact that thirty-three of the thirty-seven cocoa producing regions had voted in favour of the resolution contained in the petition.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that that fact cast new light on the petition. It now appeared that the vast majority of the farmers - thirty-three regions out of thirty-seven and not thirty-three out of seventy - had opposed the enactments of the Administering Authority. That being so, it might be interesting to know exactly to what extent the draft resolution actually met the situation. The USSR delegation had voiced its opinion by voting against the draft which made no mention of the main argument put forward by the petitioners and which discussed only one line of reasoning, that of the Special Representative. The USSR delegation considered that the petitioners' request was justified, that the Committee could not ignore the facts and that it was its duty to give satisfaction to the petitioners in its draft resolution.

Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) expressed the view that the operative part of the draft resolution took adequate account of the information supplied by both the Special Representative and Mr. Antor. Paragraphs 2 and 5 of the operative part did not deal with divisions or regions. Thus, the draft was outside the realm of controversy and, moreover, a decision had already been taken. The Belgian delegation, on the other hand, had no objection to redrafting section C of the corresponding part of the report as requested.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) expressed general agreement with the views of the representative of Belgium.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed the fact that at the beginning of the meeting the Committee had taken a second vote on a draft resolution adopted in the absence of the United States representative because that representative wished to present an amendment. He noted that many similar precedents could be cited to justify a reconsideration of the question.

The USSR delegation, therefore, proposed the insertion of a new paragraph in the preamble of the draft resolution which would begin with the words "having taken note of the statement of Mr. Antor to the effect that", continue with the entire second paragraph of section C of the corresponding part of the report (pages 32 and 33) beginning with the second sentence, replacing the words "the Union" by the words "Togoland Farmers' Union" and deleting the words "Mr. Antor stated that" in the fourth sentence of the paragraph. Mr. Soldatov called for a vote on his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN assumed that the Committee would not object to the consideration of that proposal though the draft resolution had already been adopted.

He asked the Special Representative whether he preferred to have paragraph 2 of sub-paragraph (b) of the preamble amended to make it clear that 37 regions were involved.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) preferred to leave the paragraph unchanged and had no objections to the USSR proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put the USSR proposal to the vote.

The USSR proposal was adopted by 2 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the new paragraph should be inserted after the second paragraph of the preamble ending with the words "17 and 20 July 1951".

Mr. ANTOR (Togoland Congress) accepted the text adopted by the Committee.

Mr. RAPOPORT (Secretary of the Committee) asked for information on two points.

/First,

First, he noted that draft resolutions I, IV, XII and XIII referred to passages in the Council's report on Togoland. The Drafting Committee had just completed its draft recommendations and he asked whether the Committee wished to inform the Secretariat which passages should be quoted.

Secondly, he pointed out that the part of the report dealing with draft resolution IV did not contain a summary of Mr. Antor's statement because the Committee had reached no decision in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, on the first point, the Committee could leave it to the Secretariat to decide to what passages reference should be made. As to the second question, he considered that a summary of Mr. Antor's statement on the petition from the Akpini State Council should be inserted in the corresponding part of the report.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Special Representative) and Mr. STRONG (United States of America) shared the Chairman's views on the part of the report relating to draft resolution IV.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION: DRAFT SEVENTH REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS (T/AC.41/L.12)

Draft Resolution I: Petition from Mr. Augustino de Souza (T/PET.7/123)

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) asked the representative of France whether he would accept the following drafting changes in the text of the third paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution I on that petition:

(1) Replace the words "the decision of the Representative Assembly of Togoland" by "the objection of the Representative Assembly of Togoland".

(2) In the penultimate line of the same paragraph, delete the words "with some reservations as to the future".

(3) Replace the words following "had stopped" by "had discontinued".

(4) At the end of the paragraph, add the following clause: "and to reconsider the matter in the light of the counter-proposals made by the Representative Assembly".

Mr. Strong thought that, thus amended, the text of the preamble would be clearer.

/Mr. PIGNON

Mr. PIGNON (France) was quite prepared to accept those changes.

With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, Mr. STRONG (United States of America) did not think that the Council should express the hope that the Administering Authority "will try to find a solution...". He would rather the text of the resolution were more positive, and suggested that it read "will find a solution...".

Moreover, it might be advisable to take into account not only the economic interests of the Territory, but the interests of security.

Mr. PIGNON (France) agreed to the United States proposals. He found his second suggestion especially interesting and proposed that the text should refer both to economic interests and other interests of the Territory.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) was not pressing for an explicit reference to "the interests of security" and was therefore prepared to accept the broader wording of the French representative.

Draft resolution I, as amended, was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The relevant part of the report was adopted.

Draft resolution II: petition from Mr. Augustino de Souza (T/PET.7/124)

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) said that there were two separate questions: that of teaching vernacular languages and that of using vernacular languages in teaching. He noted that the preamble of the draft resolution dealt only with the first of those questions. That omission might be corrected by altering the text of paragraph 2 of Alternative B to read:

"Decides to inform the petitioner that questions relating to the role of vernacular languages in various aspects of educational work in the Territory is and will continue to be the object of the Council's attention at the time of its annual review of conditions in the Territory."

Mr. PIGNON (France) shared the view of the United States representative. He felt that it would be fair, in the draft resolution, to recognize the efforts of the Administering Authority which had already instituted some courses in the vernacular language.

/Mr. SOLDATOV

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wanted to strengthen Alternative A proposed by his delegation by rewording it to read:

"Recommends that the Administering Authority should take the necessary steps to ensure the use of the languages of the indigenous population as languages of instruction in the schools of the Territory."

He would rather not use the term "vernacular languages" because its meaning was not clear and he considered it essential to emphasize the need to use the indigenous languages in teaching.

Mr. PIGNON (France) did not object to the principle involved in the proposed alteration, but pointed out that the recommendation could not be applied in practice. There were at least twenty-four dialects in Togoland, and while the French Government was quite prepared to have vernacular languages used more widely in the schools, it could not for practical reasons commit itself to the use of those languages in all educational work.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his proposal was based on fundamentally practical considerations. Experience in the Soviet Union had shown that it was perfectly possible for all teaching to be done in the languages spoken by the indigenous population.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) preferred the phrase "educational programmes" to "school curricula" (in the preamble) because it was broader in scope.

Alternative A (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was rejected by 3 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

Alternative B (Belgium) was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

It was decided that the necessary changes would be made in the observations of the USSR appearing on page 5 of the report.

The relevant part of the report was adopted.

Draft Resolution III: Petition from Mr. Mensan Altheon (T/PET.7/159)

Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) thought that the draft resolution should state that the petitioner "has now joined his wife in the new post to which she has been assigned". He would insert that clause in Alternative B just before paragraph 2.

Mr. PIGNON

Mr. PIGNON (France) said that he was not in a position personally to confirm the accuracy of that fact, but was inclined to believe it was true that the petitioner had in fact joined his wife as the statements of the Special Representative seemed to indicate.

Mr. STRONG (United States of America) thought that the wording suggested by the Belgian representative should more logically be included in the preamble, in a sub-paragraph (c) to be added.

Mr. RAPOPORT (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that according to newspaper clippings reaching the Secretariat, Mr. Aithson had returned to the Territory. Accordingly, the Secretariat had found it more advisable not to refer in the preamble to any change of residence of the petitioner especially as the Special Representative had not stated that it was an undisputed fact.

Mr. WENDELEN (Belgium) withdrew his proposal.

Alternative B was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

The relevant part of the report was adopted.

Draft Resolution IV: Petition from the Assemblée représentative du Togo (Representative Assembly of Togoland) (T/PET.7/169)

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested the following redrafting of Alternative A of draft resolution IV, which had been submitted by his delegation:

"Recommends that the Administering Authority should establish in the Trust Territory legislative organs with full powers, and should ensure the participation of the indigenous population in such organs".

Alternative A was rejected by 5 votes to 1.

Alternative B was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

It was decided that the necessary changes would be made in the observations of the USSR representative appearing on page 9 of the report.

The relevant part of the report was adopted.

The draft seventh report as a whole was adopted by 5 votes to 1.

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS CONCERNING TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION
SUMMARIZED IN DOCUMENT T/L.177/Add.1 (T/L.177/Add.1; T/PET.7/212, T/PET.7/212/
Add.1, T/PET.7/212/Add.2; T/PET.7/221, T/PET.7/221/Add.1; T/PET.7/225;
T/PET.7/227, T/PET.7/227/Add.1; T/PET.7/228, T/PET.7/228/Add.1; T/PET.7/235;
T/PET.7/236; T/PET.7/237, T/PET.7/237/Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN noted that several petitions received after the prescribed time limit had been summarized in document T/L.177/Add.1, and he asked the representative of France whether he preferred to have them considered at that session or at the following session of the Council.

Mr. PIGNON (France) agreed to have those petitions considered at the current session provided that such action did not constitute a precedent.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the first six petitions contained in document T/L.177/Add.1 dealt with the same subject, namely, the elections of 17 June 1951, and he therefore asked whether the Committee would agree to examine them together.

Mr. SOLDATOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had no objection to that procedure, provided it was understood to be an exceptional case and did not establish a precedent.

Mr. PIGNON (France) thanked the USSR representative for agreeing to a general examination of all petitions dealing with the elections of 17 June. That procedure would permit him to present his observations in a more systematic manner.

He explained that the question of those elections had been placed before the French National Assembly, the only body competent to deal with matters affecting legislative elections, by Mr. Aku, the unsuccessful candidate, who was contesting the election of his opponent, Mr. Grunitsky. He stated further that the Assembly would examine the question in the near future, and that its debates would be reported in the Official Journal. Accordingly, it would be appropriate, in that connexion, to invoke rule 8 of the Council's rules of procedure. Nevertheless, Mr. Pignon would review the various complaints set forth in the group of petitions under consideration.

/The first

The first complaint concerned the annual revision of the electoral lists, which had taken place in January 1951. Certain petitions, in particular those from the Comité de l'Unité togolaise (T/PET.7/212, T/PET.7/212/Add.1 and T/PET.7/212/Add.2) accused the French Administration of having facilitated registration by voters in the northern section at the expense of those of the southern section. Mr. Pignon pointed out that that allegation was unfounded. An official procedure had been laid down for such registration, and the persons concerned could always appeal to the courts. Even though some voters might be ignorant of that fact, the political parties were cognizant of it and could inform their members. He also declared that the charge of lack of proper publication of the lists was unfounded. Moreover, under a new provision, adopted at the beginning of 1951, the electoral commissions met in the chief towns of the various subdivisions, which were more accessible to the voters.

The second series of complaints concerned the exceptional revision of the electoral lists which had taken place in May 1951, as a result of the Electoral Act of 23 May which had established two new categories of voters: mothers of two children who were either living or had died in the service of France, and women who were heads of families or households. Owing to the date fixed for the elections, that revision had had to be effected very quickly. Many petitions had been received protesting against the conditions under which the revision had taken place, and he proposed to reply to the charges made in documents T/PET.7/212, T/PET.7/212/Add.1, T/PET.7/225, T/PET.7/227 and T/PET.7/235. In those petitions the Administration was accused of having favoured the Parti togolaise du progrès at the expense of the Comité de l'unité togolaise; of having shown favouritism to the northern section, where the Comité had fewer supporters, at the expense of the southern section, which, in the opinion of the petitioners, had a higher cultural development; and of having interfered with registration by requiring the presentation of an identity card. Mr. Pignon explained, first, that the Administration had not required an identity card, but simply an identity document, such as a labour card, a military service certificate, or a tax receipt. He added that the proposal to make the possession of an identity card obligatory had been rejected by the Representative Assembly, in which

/the Comité

the Comité de l'unité togolaise had a majority; ^{he} attributed that decision to the fact that the Comité drew a large number of its supporters from the migratory population of Lomé who had originally come from the Gold Coast. He then refuted the allegation that the Administration had systematically facilitated registrations in the northern section. He explained that in that section a larger number of individuals possessed identity documents, in particular military service certificates, since most of the indigenous infantry had been recruited in the northern section, and tax receipts, because the superior organization of the chiefdoms in the northern part of the country made tax evasions more infrequent. Finally, Mr. Pignon replied to the claim that the southern section, which was more highly developed from a cultural point of view, should have more voters than the northern section. The new categories of voters provided for by the Act were not based upon extent of education, but upon other principles, which he had mentioned. As regards the comparisons drawn between the number of voters registered in the northern and in the southern sections of Togoland (T/PET.7/212/Add.2), and between the number registered in Togoland and in the colony of Dahomey (T/PET.7/228, T/PET.7/228/Add.1), he observed that according to the table given in document T/PET.7/212/Add.2, the Lama-Kera district, which the petitioners claimed had received preferential treatment from a partial Administration, had fewer voters than Lomé, although its population was larger. He regarded the comparison drawn between Togoland and Dahomey as invalid, since it was natural that the number of voters should be larger in Dahomey, a more highly developed country, where civil status was easier to establish owing to the existence of compulsory military service and a more exact tax-collection system under which women were liable to taxation and where a larger number of political parties counted a greater proportion of the voters among their members.

Other complaints, set forth in the petitions published as documents T/PET.7/227/Add.1 and T/PET.7/235, dealt with the electoral campaign itself, a campaign in which the Administration was charged with having intervened in favour of the Parti togolais du progrès. He could not furnish exact information on that point, but in his opinion the complaint was a manifestation of the bitterness of the defeated party. The activities of which the Commissioner of the Republic and the Administrator were accused seemed to him entirely normal. In fact, it was one of their duties to make tours of inspection in order to supervise the conduct of the elections.

The fourth group of complaints had to do with the organization of the elections. The petitions set forth in documents T/PET.7/212, T/PET.7/212/Add.2, T/PET.7/225, T/PET.7/227/Add.1 and T/PET.7/235 charged the Administration with having violated the decree to give effect to the Act by having voting cards distributed by its own agents rather than by the commissions in charge of revising the electoral lists. Mr. Pignon felt that the complaints were based upon a deliberate misunderstanding of the role of those commissions. The decree to give effect to the Act of 23 May 1951, Section II, articles 3 and 4, provided that the commissions would be in charge of verification and supervision, but not of distributing the cards. He then replied to the complaints concerning the location of the polling stations, which were said to be too close together in some instances and too far apart in others. In his opinion the facts presented were not conclusive. Finally, the Administration was accused of having provided free transport facilities to certain voters. He explained that such facilities had been placed at the disposal of all voters without discrimination. The petitioner stated that it would have been better to let the political parties organize transport for their voters. But he neglected to mention the fact that in that event the Comité de l'unité togolaise would have been able to use all the transport facilities at the disposal of Mr. Sylvanus Olympio, director of United Africa (U.A.C.) in Lomé.

Turning to the complaints concerning the voting itself (T/PET.7/212/Add.2, T/PET.7/235), he pointed out that the statements made in those petitions were contradicted by the petition of Mr. Pedro Olympio (T/PET.7/221).

In conclusion, Mr. Pignon stated that the elections had been carried out in an atmosphere of perfect calm, without incident and without any need for police intervention, and that in accordance with the Electoral Act voting had taken place in all polling stations, in the presence of a representative of each candidate.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.